

# IDAHO SDI PROJECT-STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

## SUMMARY NOTES FROM NAMPA-JUNE 24

Prepared, 7-10-2008

### Introduction

These are summary notes from the stakeholder meeting for Idaho Spatial Data Infrastructure Planning Project on June 24, 2008 in Nampa. The SDI planning project has the main objective of preparing strategic and business plans to guide long-term enhancement and development of a statewide SDI. This is one of 6 regional stakeholder meetings conducted at different locations around the state (other locations include McCall, Lewiston, Post Falls, Pocatello, Twin Falls) during the month of June. The purpose of these meetings was to:

- Get input and ideas for achieving the SDI
- Learn about status of stakeholder GIS use, business needs, and ideas on direction and goals
- Build stakeholder understanding of and support for statewide SDI development

Participants are encouraged to submit comments, clarification, additional points, etc. Comments and mark-ups may be submitted in electronic form (highlighted mark-up of this document) by **July 30, 2008**. Please submit via email to Gail Ewart ([gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov](mailto:gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov)) and Peter Croswell ([pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com](mailto:pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com)).

### Meeting Participants and Contact Information

Name	Organization	Phone/Email Address
Nick Nydegger	State of Idaho Military Division and Idaho Geospatial Committee (IGC) Chair	208-272-4182, <a href="mailto:nick.nydegger@id.ngb.army.mil">nick.nydegger@id.ngb.army.mil</a>
Gail Ewart	Idaho Geospatial Office, State GIO and SDI project manager	208-332-1879, <a href="mailto:gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov">gail.ewart@cio.idaho.gov</a>
Peter Croswell	Croswell-Schulte IT Consultants, contracted facilitator and project manager	502-848-8827, <a href="mailto:pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com">pcroswell@croswell-schulte.com</a>
Jack Clark	Ada County Assessor	
Roy Powell	Sage Community Resources	323-7033, <a href="mailto:rpowell@sageidaho.com">rpowell@sageidaho.com</a>
Rod Collins	City of Nampa	468-5421, <a href="mailto:collinsr@cityofnampa.us">collinsr@cityofnampa.us</a>
Anne Kawalac	Ada County Assessor	287-7261, <a href="mailto:akawalac@adaweb.net">akawalac@adaweb.net</a>
Chris Clay	Idaho Dept. of Lands	334-0273, <a href="mailto:cclay@idl.idaho.gov">cclay@idl.idaho.gov</a>
Jon Norred	City of Nampa	<a href="mailto:norredj@cityofnampa.us">norredj@cityofnampa.us</a>
Julie Brown	Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security	<a href="mailto:jbrown@bhs.idaho.gov">jbrown@bhs.idaho.gov</a>
Gene Kuehn	Canyon County Assessor	454-7431, <a href="mailto:gkuehn@canyonco.org">gkuehn@canyonco.org</a>
Jimae Haynes	City of Boise	433-5605, <a href="mailto:jhaynes@cityofboise.org">jhaynes@cityofboise.org</a>
Chandler Coleman	Consultant	949-9309, <a href="mailto:chan_cole@yahoo.com">chan_cole@yahoo.com</a>
Michael Ciscell	Idaho Dept. of Water Resources	287-4915, <a href="mailto:mciscell@idwr.idaho.gov">mciscell@idwr.idaho.gov</a>
Mike Borzick	Canyon County Development Services Dept	206-9134, <a href="mailto:mborzick@canyonco.org">mborzick@canyonco.org</a>
Danielle Favreau	Idaho Dept. of Water Resources	297-4938, <a href="mailto:Danielle.Favreau@idwr.gov">Danielle.Favreau@idwr.gov</a>
Gary O. Grimm	Mountain Visions	336-2992, <a href="mailto:gogrimm@mountainvisions.com">gogrimm@mountainvisions.com</a>
Tina Fenski	City of Garden City	375-3194, <a href="mailto:tfenski@gardencityidaho.org">tfenski@gardencityidaho.org</a>
Charlla Adams	Boise State University	426-1726, <a href="mailto:cadams2@boisestate.edu">cadams2@boisestate.edu</a>
Bob Smith	Idaho Geospatial Office	332-1867, <a href="mailto:Robert.smith@cio.idaho.gov">Robert.smith@cio.idaho.gov</a>
Brian Emmen	Idaho Transportation Dept.	334-7889, <a href="mailto:Brian.Emmen@itd.idaho.gov">Brian.Emmen@itd.idaho.gov</a>
Angie Hopf	City of Caldwell	455-4685, <a href="mailto:ahopf@ci.caldwell.id.us">ahopf@ci.caldwell.id.us</a>
Sarah Higuera	Canyon County	455??-6016, <a href="mailto:sarah@canyonco.org">sarah@canyonco.org</a>
Scott Van Hoff	US Geological Survey, State Liaison	890-6092, <a href="mailto:svanhoff@usgs.gov">svanhoff@usgs.gov</a>
Cargie Aitchison	Idaho Transportation Dept.	334-8228, <a href="mailto:cargie.aitchison@itd.idaho.gov">cargie.aitchison@itd.idaho.gov</a>
Mark Wasdahl	Idaho Transportation Dept.-D3	334-8344, <a href="mailto:mark.wasdahl@itd.idaho.gov">mark.wasdahl@itd.idaho.gov</a>
Carl Rudeen	Mountain Home Air Force Base, 366 CES/CEV	<a href="mailto:Carl.rudeen@mountainhome.af.mil">Carl.rudeen@mountainhome.af.mil</a>
Cindy Lou McDonald	Bureau of Land Management State Office	<a href="mailto:Cindy_lou_mcdonald@blm.gov">Cindy_lou_mcdonald@blm.gov</a>
Sheldon Bluestein		<a href="mailto:shelblue@q.com">shelblue@q.com</a>
DeRay Jensen	Mountain Home Air Force Base, 366 CES/CECP	828-1335, <a href="mailto:deray.jensen@mountainhome.af.mil">deray.jensen@mountainhome.af.mil</a>
Bryant Ralston	ESRI	(406) 825-0140, <a href="mailto:bralston@esri.com">bralston@esri.com</a>

Jay Young	City of Nampa Eng/Police Dept	468-5466, <a href="mailto:youngj@cityofnamp.org">youngj@cityofnamp.org</a>
Nathan Bentley	Ada County Information Technology Dept.	287-7021, <a href="mailto:nbentley@adaweb.net">nbentley@adaweb.net</a>
Jacob Mundt	Ada County-Weed and Pest Management	575-4640, <a href="mailto:jmundt@adaweb.net">jmundt@adaweb.net</a>
Kevin Jones	Canyon County DSD	454-7458, <a href="mailto:kjones@canyonco.org">kjones@canyonco.org</a>
Ross Dodge	Compass	855-2558 ext. 235, <a href="mailto:rdodge@compassidaho.org">rdodge@compassidaho.org</a>
Molly Maupin	US Geological Survey-Water Resources Division	387-1307, <a href="mailto:mamaupin@usgs.gov">mamaupin@usgs.gov</a>
Karla Baker	City of Caldwell	455-4681, <a href="mailto:kbaker@ci.caldwell.id.us">kbaker@ci.caldwell.id.us</a>
Jon Bryant	Idaho Power	388-2832, <a href="mailto:jbryant@idahopower.com">jbryant@idahopower.com</a>
Miko Bruse	Canyon County	<a href="mailto:mbruse@canyonco.org">mbruse@canyonco.org</a>
Jim Szpara	Idaho Dept. Environmental Quality	<a href="mailto:Jim.szpara@deq.idaho.gov">Jim.szpara@deq.idaho.gov</a>
Jim Hetherington	City of Boise	384-3918, <a href="mailto:jhetherington@cityofboise.org">jhetherington@cityofboise.org</a>
Linda Davis	Idaho Dept. Water Resources	<a href="mailto:Linda.davis@idwr.idaho.gov">Linda.davis@idwr.idaho.gov</a>
Donna Pitzer	US Bureau of Reclamation	<a href="mailto:dpitzer@pn.usbr.gov">dpitzer@pn.usbr.gov</a>
Tony Morse	Idaho Dept. Water Resources	<a href="mailto:Tony.morse@idwr.idaho.gov">Tony.morse@idwr.idaho.gov</a>

## Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Business Drivers and Business Needs for GIS
3. High-level Characterization of GIS Status and Obstacles
4. Geospatial Data Activities and Needs
5. Ideas for Improvements to Statewide GIS Access and Coordination
6. Brainstorm Session on Mission, Vision, and Goals for Implementing Idaho's Spatial Information Infrastructure
7. Summarize Results of Meeting and Identify Follow-up

## Summary Notes

Business Drivers (major program area, need, or challenge that GIS technology and geospatial data can help support or address)

- Asset Management: use of GIS to support inventory of infrastructure assets (e.g., sewer utility, streets, street lighting, wells) and work management. GIS supports decisions on maintenance activities.
- Support for information response (internal and external public requests). Example: questions about permit status, parcel and property appraisals from Assessors. GIS supports automated, 24X7 information access by the public from government agencies at state and local level.
- Currentness/Integrity of Data: GIS supports effective update of geographic information and can provide high-integrity data and confidence in the data by users. This can result in less time needed for research and field data gathering for projects. GIS database, if properly maintained with sound metadata can provide a single "authoritative source" for a range of location-based data.
- Value of Legacy/Historical geographic information: Current projects and information requests require ready access to historical information (parcels, land use, infrastructure) and GIS provides effective tool for geographic query and display of historical information to support such needs as: a) research in legal investigations, b) engineering project design, c) tracking change and analyzing growth changes
- Basis for Partnerships: GIS supports inter-organization collaboration and partnerships since much of the data is needed by multiple organizations and cost savings/cost sharing and efficiencies come from collaboration
- Support for 2010 Census. Note: it was observed that there is discrepancy between "Census geography" that will be used by the Census Bureau and digital maps maintained by local jurisdictions creating likely problem in census enumeration district boundary matching (based on road centerlines and other features). Some cities in Idaho provided local data for Census (LUCA program) but most did not.
- Support for Improved Regulatory Decisions: GIS data and mapping and analysis capabilities can result in better response to regulatory requirements and improved regulatory decisions. (e.g., ID Water Resources decisions on water shutdowns, weed/pest treatments and tracking (Ada Co.), ID Dept Lands Forest Practices Act including decisions on private forest land management

- Emergency Management: providing data to support emergency response. Also, GIS data can help resolve confusion about cross-jurisdictional issues in fire and law enforcement response (more clear information on boundaries and jurisdictional responsibilities).
- Growth management
- Tracking City Annexations: providing information on City boundary changes and tracking state approvals of submitted annexations.
- Transportation planning
- Geographic Modeling: use of analysis capabilities to support such applications as: a) aquifer flow modeling, crime pattern analysis, disaster /evac route planning, growth modeling, migration??
- Support and Collaboration with Privately Contracted projects: GIS data from government agencies can support engineering project design contracted to private firms (potentially cutting down on costs for information collection). Note: There is need for better coordination with private companies to obtain digital data from projects to use as source for GIS database update.
- GIS role as part of emerging Web-centric environment: Web 2 collaboration, semantic Web, knowledge search and discovery

### Current GIS Status, Obstacles, Limitations

- Barriers between GIS and “Mainstream IT”: In some cases, GIS still seen as a niche system and not integrated with an organization’s overall IT programs which negatively impacts effective use of staff resources, system integration, etc.
- Problems in Getting/Maintaining Qualified GIS Staff: this includes finding people with sound skills including “hard” technical skills along with knowledge of disciplines for application of GIS technology. Turnover is a problem—trained people have other job opportunities and it is hard to compete with the overall job market. GIS staff need more training and exposure to traditional IT practices and systems and “IT people” need to learn more about GIS databases and applications. “Critical thinking” skills are vital and not always taught or encouraged. Need for GIS “continuing education.”
- Poor Understanding of GIS Data Content and Accuracy: Users do not always understand the accuracy or other quality factors of the data being access and may use it inappropriately. Note: This brings up the need for easily accessible and clearly understood metadata and disclaimer statements
- Senior Management Awareness and Understanding of GIS and its Uses: Senior officials (including elected officials) at all levels need more information to help “contextualize GIS” —more information to show how GIS technology supports their organization mission and user needs. Acknowledgement that there is a need to target key leaders to get additional support for GIS development and use. There is a problem in understanding by senior officials on the resources it really takes to develop and sustain GIS operations. It is important to provide clear information on resources (money, people) that is required.
- Lack of Understanding about Time and Resources: Lack of understanding among senior officials and staff about the time it takes to capture and process GIS data—including time to process raw data from field.
- Problems with Sound Data Management: Not enough attention and sound practices for GIS data compilation, update, and management. This concern brings up several issues: a) users/management unsure of and have less confidence in quality of data, b) data security and disaster management for data protection, c) poor GIS data management limits integration of GIS data with “non-GIS” data sources. This reflects that organizations rarely treat data as an asset.
- Inconsistencies in Data Formats: Insufficient level of standards and use of standards for GIS data statewide. This inhibits creation and sharing of data across jurisdictional boundaries.
- Insufficient Information on Data Updates: Not always easily accessible information on when GIS data sets are updated or knowing which data set is the most current.
- Organizational barriers: lack of communication, inherent bureaucratic barriers between organizations make it difficult to get good level of “horizontal” integration and coordination on GIS projects
- Multiple/Duplicative Data Sets: Many government jurisdictions see cases where the same or similar data is redundantly maintained by different Departments but using different formats (e.g., multiple road centerlines). This results in duplicating resources in data maintenance. This brings up need for better data standards and design templates to encourage consistency. Also the need for coordination and distribution of data maintenance tasks
- Statutory limitations: some state laws do not address GIS-related issues. This is most evident in ID public records law and inconsistencies at the local level on policies and procedures for access and distribution of GIS data and products—including policies for fee setting. There is need for more consistent policies that can be applied statewide in a way that does not result in inhibiting access to GIS data. Need to examine possible requirement for changing wording of law or getting more clarification, possible AG opinion.

- Rapid Technological Changes: the rapid pace of technology (e.g., software changes) makes it difficult to manage GIS and stay current

## Geospatial Data Status and Needs

- Framework Themes: Gail Ewart discussed current Idaho Framework Data Themes (commonly needed data by majority of stakeholders) with idea that this definition can be adapted as part of this SDI project. Current Idaho Framework Themes are a) Geodetic Control, b) Cadastral, c) Orthoimagery, d) Transportation, e) Land Use/Land Cover, f) Hydrography/Watersheds, g) Elevation, h) Governmental Units.
- Status of Framework development work at state level:
  - GIO preparing proposed process for standards making and approval
  - Imagery – 2009 NAIP partnership purchase. Contribution commitments & upgrade needs
  - Cadastral Reference (updating GCDB). Assessors and surveyors are also involved; plans are beginning to gel; led by Sheldon Bluestein
  - Parcels – working on goals and objectives for statewide ownership; led by Craig Rindlisbacher and Jeff Servatius
  - Geodetic Control – ITD has agreed to be the lead agency for Height Modernization. Next steps include writing a proposal
- Orthoimagery: Gail Ewart discussed current project in place for full state coverage of orthoimagery as part of Farm Service Agency National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP). This will deliver 1-meter resolution (3-bands) statewide with opportunity for increased resolution and IR band for selected areas. This is leaf-on coverage. Mechanism is set-up to support contributions of funding for consortium purchase.
- Inconsistencies in Data Formats: Not sufficient level of standards and use of standards for GIS data statewide. This inhibits creation and sharing of data across jurisdictional boundaries.
- Insufficient Information on Data Updates: Not always easily accessible information on when GIS data sets are updated or knowing which data set is the most current.
- Multiple/Duplicative Data Sets: Many government jurisdictions see cases where the same or similar data is redundantly maintained by different Departments but using different formats (e.g., multiple road centerlines). This results in duplicating resources in data maintenance
- Metadata is critical. Metadata promotes effective data access and use and helps to sustain the value and confidence in the data.
- Parcel database: important to work toward consistent, statewide, sufficiently accurate “parcel fabric” statewide. Note: There is currently a survey distributed to Assessors statewide to get information in parcel/property mapping status and needs. Survey will continue during the summer and results will be processed in the Fall of this year. Idaho Power Support in Parcel Database Development: Idaho Power has great need for accurate parcel data and has applied staff resources for technical assistance and database development support with some local Assessor offices to support digital parcel mapping
- Geographic Coordinate Database (GCDB): Acknowledgement of strong need for GCDB accuracy improvements. In many cases, coordinate assigned to PLSS corners based on old GLO surveys and are not accurate. BLM corner data needs improvement.
- Local Assessor Needs for Parcel information on Federal Land: Parcels on federally owned land are exempt from taxation and often are not tracked carefully. But there are needs by local Assessors for parcels on Federal lands: a) payment in lieu of taxes (PILT). these are payments to Counties by Fed Gov with large federal holdings in order to support local government activities due to low tax base, b) grazing fees and timber sales, c) cases of land sales and acquisition changing hands with private ownership
- Survey Control Sources: much good survey control and monumentation information maintained by private survey companies. Is there a more effective way to gather this information and make it more accessible?
- Orthoimagery: General need for orthoimagery and interest in statewide 1-meter NAIP imagery as well as higher resolution sources. Some interest in adding a near-IR band
- Landsat Continuity Mission: mention was made of the current federal commitment to launch a new Landsat satellite for (Thematic Mapper sensor) to provide ongoing images in visible and near-IR bands. Launch scheduled for mid-2011.
- Site-based photos: Observation about the value of site-based photos which are “geotagged” for access through GIS. Digital cameras and cell phone cameras with GPS capability are available on market to automatically capture and tag coordinate information.
- Governmental Boundaries: it was acknowledged that there are problems with accurately definition of county boundaries (originally surveys not clear or monuments not recovered) and that resolving all these problems could be difficult and time consuming. It is important to identify these problems and establish basis for resolving them. Priority for boundary resolution should be in cases where there is a business need: a) areas of development, b) where property ownership/taxation issues are major concerns, c) where emergency services jurisdictional questions are important

- Governmental/Administrative Boundaries Vertical Integration: Big concern about boundary relationship among range of governmental, service areas, taxing districts, etc. that share boundaries among themselves and with other map features (parcels, road centerlines). This is extremely important issue in creation and update of GIS data.
- Census Enumeration Area Boundaries: it was observed that there is discrepancy between "Census geography" that will be used by the Census Bureau and digital maps maintained by local jurisdictions creating likely problem in census enumeration district boundary matching (based on road centerlines and other features). Some cities in Idaho provided local data for Census (LUCA program) but most did not.
- Taxing Districts: State Tax Commission has critical role in gathering and "vetting" parcel and tax district information from local Assessors. Rules have been established for submittal of information.
- Annexations and Taxing District relationship: Proposed annexations from cities require review and approval by State Tax Commission. Annexations have critical impact on taxing districts, and this information is not always tracked or communicated accurately among parties that need this information. This is a critical workflow issue that needs more clearly defined procedures and information distribution.
- Timing of State Tax Commission Review: GIS database update for ongoing parcel and taxing district boundary changes can be complicated by annual cycle of State tax Commission and need to capture an annual "snapshot" for creation of the tax roll and property taxation. Need to incorporate way to capture the snapshot at the proper point in time while maintaining the GIS database in response to ongoing changes (e.g. parcel splits and combinations, new subdivisions).
- Emergency Services Boundaries: It was noted that there are problems in defining Fire District boundaries resulting in difficulty in defining Emergency Service Zones (ESNs) and having clear definition of jurisdictional responsibilities for emergency response.
- Water and Sewer: Water and sewer GIS data maintained by city utility departments, utility districts, and some private water companies (United Water). Data formats not standardized. General sense that it would be difficult to incorporate a statewide SDI theme for water and sewer utility networks. There are concerns about data security associated with "critical infrastructure" (data access for terrorism purposes). It was noted that there is no consistent policy to respond to critical infrastructure concerns. This creates inconsistencies and obstacles to respond to valid needs for access to water and sewer infrastructure information (need to support local government planning and development activities).
- Electric and Gas: Similar concerns to those expressed above for water and sewer data. These data sets controlled by private utility companies (except for small number of municipal utilities). Important to have clear agreements between private utilities and government agencies when data is needed for governmental programs. In some cases, these agreements are in place.
- Pipeline Data: Pipelines include petroleum, natural gas, gasoline. This information is sometimes needed for local and statewide economic development activities. Mention was made of the "National Energy Plan." Land Use, Land Cover, Wetlands: Need for classification scheme for land use and land cover information and question about whether land use and land cover require separate classification schemes. Mention was made of classification schemes in Oregon, North Carolina, and the scheme developed in recent years by the APA. Mention was also made of the need for vegetation and wetland mapping (which is related to but different than land use or land cover).
- Zoning information is important for local planning and economic development. No statewide consistency in zoning classification.
- Critical facilities to support Public Safety: need GIS layer that captures features typically needed for emergency planning and response: e.g., fire stations, schools, government buildings, medical facilities, PSAP boundaries
- HSIP: mention was made about the federal Homeland Security Department HSIP database. Information not generally available unless by special agreement with local or state authorities after Presidential declaration of national emergency.
- Floodplain mapping: some expressed interest in flood plain mapping but concerns about quality of FEMA DFIRM production (just digitization of old paper maps which are not highly accurate and do not reflect current local conditions that could impact flood levels). Mention was made of the statewide effort in North Carolina to resurvey (Lidar and field based) elevations and carryout hydrological analysis for a remapping of floodplains.
- Data Security/Business Continuity: Discussion about need for secure and redundant storage of data to support pre-positioning for access during disasters and sound disaster recovery of data.

## Discussion on Draft Vision and Mission (reaction to draft Vision and Mission statements prepared by the Executive Steering Committee)

### **Draft Vision:**

"Idaho's spatial data infrastructure is widely used to enhance and expedite public- and private-sector policies and decisions for the benefit of Idahoans and beyond"

### **Draft Mission:**

"Idaho's geospatial community will deliver a robust statewide spatial data infrastructure that supports routine and extraordinary business needs"

- Vision: phrase "...and beyond" is a little fuzzy and ill-defined; some liked its forward feel
- Vision: phrase "benefit of Idahoans and beyond" has a grammar problem
- Vision/Mission: try to incorporate the idea of "building" the database, not just using it.
- Need to reflect trends and value of "Geoweb" as basis for the SDI
- Vision: phrase "...and beyond". Maybe just use phrase, "Idahoans" or "...Idahoans and the nation".
- Remember not exclude Tribal nations which are not strictly part of Idaho government jurisdictions.
- Mission: Maybe use phrase, "...will provide and make accessible...". Maybe use term "dynamic"

## Discussion on Draft Goals (reaction to draft Vision and Mission statements prepared by the Executive Steering Committee)

### **Draft Goals:**

1. Secure sustained funding to support SDI implementation and management by the end of 2010.
  2. Develop and establish pathways for stewarding Framework data by March 1, 2009.
  3. Create and effectively communicate a sound business case for the SDI that promotes alignment of investments in spatial data and technology by the end of June 30, 2009.
  4. Support regional GIS user groups and establish or enhance regional centers to aggregate and extend access to Framework and the technology to use it, with emphasis on low-resourced jurisdictions and organizations not able to maintain GIS capability on their own beginning in 2009.
  5. Conceive and implement an improved governance and coordination structure, with appropriate legislation, policies, and management practices that support realization of the SDI by the end of 2009.
  6. Support local data development through collaboratively developing standards, supporting partnerships, and providing funding by July 1, 2010.
  7. Create an effective communication, education and support environment and tools that increase awareness, broad support, and wide use of the SDI.
  8. Expand the use of spatial data and technology into new business areas.
- Maybe assign priority to goals or order in priority. Plan needs to incorporate idea of performance measures and performance tracking.
  - #7: address theme of "best practices"
  - Ensure consistency between goals and the Vision and Mission statement
  - #2: the term "stewarding" is not clearly understood by all.
  - #4: there is some overlap with other goals
  - #4 and #6: be careful about implying that there will be full support for "low-resourced" counties—i.e. that there will be funding support for GIS activities from the state without a requirement for local resources
  - #8: do we need this one? Is it reflected in vision statement
  - #2: include term, "...deliver"

### Potential Initiatives (ideas on important initiatives to be cited in the strategic and business plans for SDI development)

- Data Clearinghouse: need better definition of data clearinghouse function and role. What type of services (in addition to just data download) should be provided?
- Inside Idaho Clearinghouse Infrastructure and funding: Inside Idaho needs more stable funding than is now provided through the UofI Library. Also a need for more stable infrastructure (fault tolerance).
- Support for Low-resourced Jurisdictions: Important to provide approach for access to GIS data and applications via Web for small counties and cities without the resources to implement their own GIS program and system. Note: this is a form of outsourcing data and services and could be provided through a number of organizational/service models (public, private, university)
- Take better advantage of Web-based training and educational opportunities
- Regional Centers: general interest in the idea of creation of regional centers although not a consensus on their structure. Mention was made of IGC discussion of this concept about 3 years ago
- Could use set of "best practices" that address all areas of GIS management and operations that could be used as a basis for GIS programs statewide.
- Information Access Legislation: Revise ID Public Records law or get more clear explanation and policies on impacts on GIS data distribution, fees for data sales and licensing, etc. need consistent statewide policies that are applied by all government entities
- SDI governance: seek state legislation for stronger basis for statewide SDI governance structure
- Recorder Fee and Special Land Information System Fund: Attempt has been made before for legislation to establish allocation and fees applied to County Recorders land –related filings for fund that can be used for local GIS (e.g. parcel development) activities. Consensus that it is worth trying this again
- Business case for E911 fund allocation: Prepare a business case for local use of E911 funds for GIS database development and application development that supports public safety
- SDI development and governance should include clear definition of data sources, stewards, and workflow relationships impacting data update and distribution.
- Data Currentness Tracking: need to improve access to information that identifies data updates and currentness
- Virtual Clearinghouse: general consensus that the future data clearinghouse model should be "virtual" meaning that not all data needs to be centralized in one or small number of locations (although some might). Clearinghouse should function also as a portal for direct connection with custodian Web sites for direct data access.

### Other Information and Ideas

- Support for 2010 Census. Note: it was observed that there is discrepancy between "Census geography" that will be used by the Census Bureau and digital maps maintained by local jurisdictions creating likely problem in census enumeration district boundary matching (based on road centerlines and other features). Some cities in Idaho provided local data for Census (LUCA program) but most did not.
- City of Boise has a Web Service called "after 3:00" **\*\*follow-up for more info**
- Idaho Power has used "GIS Day" as an opportunity to provide programs and information on GIS and how it supports real needs and applications
- There is need for better access or directories to educational materials about GIS (targeting all audiences).
- Need to find better ways to promote, communicate, and get acceptance of data standards
- Several people emphasized the need to convey Internet, Web-based trends and models as a basis for all elements of the state's Spatial Data Infrastructure. This means reflecting growth of "Web 2," "Web 3," and GeoWeb trends that support improved ways for knowledge management, semantic Web queries, collaboration, Web-based visualization of geographic data. See Google-ESRI announcement of "Where 2.0"
- The "Google Earth" Web-based type of GIS service provides a potential model for widely access Web-based services for the SDI
- GIS-IT integration is extremely important. Implies organizational integration with IT programs and building of skill sets and common language
- Examine URISA program for Public Participation GIS (PPGIS)



- It was noted that Idaho has a very sound set of higher education institutions with GIS programs and training opportunities
- Need to focus on funding streams as they impact the data maintenance and use of GIS—connection between GIS and organization's business processes
- Idaho Power Table Top Exercise for disaster preparedness \*\*need to follow-up